

Sanitized - Approved For Release :

1991

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

February 16, 1967

mission. Obviously they are more interested in justification than in justice.

But, ask any law-enforcement officer in this country today why crime is on the increase and I venture to say, in 90 percent of the answers, they will cite as reasons the modern view by our courts that the criminal is only a victim of social or economic circumstances. The old view that a crime is a crime and should be dealt with by swift, certain, and impartial justice is completely alien to many judges serving on the bench today. In all too many instances, the courts are pampering the criminal at the expense of the victim. In my view, once wrongdoers are convinced that lawlessness will not be tolerated and that they will be called upon to account for their acts, then and only then will crime decrease.

In the court's anxious desire not to offend the criminal, several ridiculous situations have developed, including some areas where arresting officers are required to present a card to the apprehended criminal virtually suggesting that he remain silent. It must seem disillusioning for a policeman to risk his life to capture a criminal, and then have an accomplice to the crime escape because of such requirements. Justifiably, many officers are more apprehensive about resulting charges against them in making an arrest than the danger of apprehending the criminal.

Of course this deplorable situation has resulted from decisions by the Supreme Court including the infamous Miranda against Arizona case which stripped law enforcement officers from any advantage that they might have in dealing with the criminal through immediate interrogation. I had always believed that the law under the Bill of Rights was designed to protect the innocent. But, in the Miranda decision, the innocent victim is left on his own while, to the detriment of law and order, the guilty can remain silent and—in all too many instances—go free without paying his debt to society. This means that the criminal on more local technicalities can return to society to inflict more wrong on the innocent. Only recently, a national study pointed out that 85 percent of those apprehended for crime were repeat offenders.

This situation handcuffs the law enforcement officer and is resulting in a serious blow to police morale, which is reported to be at an alltime low, especially in the Nation's Capital. Such a condition is tantamount to order for the hardened criminal, and yet no effort is being made either by the administration or the courts to relieve this critical problem.

In my opinion, one way to boost the lot of the policeman and to curtail the rising crime rate is by legislation to restrict the court from throwing out voluntary confessions by criminals. Today I am introducing a House joint resolution which sets forth an amendment to the Constitution relative to reversal or modification of a criminal action by a Federal court when the decision of the trial court was based either wholly or in part on voluntary confession. I believe that such a bill is a step in the right direction toward law and order and I extend to my

colleagues an invitation to join me in sponsoring this legislation.

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

(Mr. CHAMBERLAIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Merry-Go-Round by Drew Pearson appearing in the Washington Post this morning made reference to the briefing for Members of the House at the White House last Wednesday night and to the questions asked by some of those present. His column states, among other things, that—

Charles Chamberlain of Lansing, Mich., a GOP oldtimer, wanted to know why we hadn't gone in and used every bomb in the arsenal against every target available.

Mr. Speaker, it is true that I was invited to the White House by the President and I did attend the briefing last Wednesday. Further, the President accorded to me the opportunity to ask the very first question of the evening. However, I asked no question of Secretary McNamara as Mr. Pearson infers. Nor did I ask any question relating to bombing. The reference contained in Mr. Pearson's column of this date as it relates to me is totally inaccurate. I will be pleased to yield at this time to any of my colleagues who were present at the White House briefing last week who might wish to take exception in any way to what I have just said.

In view of this inaccurate report regarding my participation in this briefing session, I would like to take this occasion to set the record straight. When asked by the President if I had any questions, I stated that I had long been concerned with free world shipping to North Vietnam and commended the effort that had been made to reduce this traffic from 256 vessels in 1965 to 74 in 1966. I then went on to state that I was disturbed that 6 vessels flying free world flags had sailed to the port of Haiphong in January 1967 and I asked specifically what was being done to stop this shipping, particularly in view of the fact that the cargoes carried by these vessels was classified secret.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my understanding that the briefings at the White House for Members of Congress were an off the record type and for that reason I have made no statements to the press or any news sources as to what transpired. It is regrettable such distortions flow from these gatherings for they cannot help but inhibit a free exchange of ideas with respect to great problems that are of crucial importance to our country and to the world.

AN IMMEDIATE INVESTIGATION OF THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY AND THE U.S. NATIONAL STUDENT ASSOCIATION SHOULD BE CONDUCTED BY CONGRESS

(Mr. UTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ad-

dress the House today on a matter of substantial concern to me. I refer to the highly questionable relationships between the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Student Association—NSA—which were disclosed this week. I am confident that my concern is shared by many, if not most Members and by a multitude of concerned American citizens.

On July 26 of last year, I addressed the House on the relationships between the Department of State and NSA. At that time I never anticipated the shocking announcements of this week that NSA was being financially backed by the CIA to the tune of as much as \$400,000.

So that the record will be clear as to the issues which I raised last year concerning NSA's relations with the Federal Government and so that the background on this matter is known to all, I include, under unanimous consent, the full text of my remarks last July 26 at this point in my remarks today. Those remarks follow:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE FUNDS TO NATIONAL STUDENT ASSOCIATION SHOULD BE INVESTIGATED

(Mr. UTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, the activities of the U.S. National Student Association—NSA—have disturbed many Members of Congress over the past several years. Despite NSA's tax exempt status, it has persistently participated in blatantly political activities. During the past several years, NSA has become increasingly critical of a strong American foreign policy, especially in southeast Asia.

NSA has passed resolutions which call for the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities; which call for the United States to sponsor the admission of Red China to the United Nations; which call for a halt to United States bombing of North Vietnam; which call for the inclusion of the Vietcong—National Liberation Front—in any negotiations for a ceasefire; which call for an end to all U.S. "aggressive military action" in Vietnam; which oppose the McCarran Act—the Internal Security Act of 1950; which support the free speech movement at the University of California at Berkeley—a movement which California legislative investigating committees and the Federal Bureau of Investigation have deemed as infiltrated by radical left-wing elements; and which have called for a myriad of other extremist positions.

NSA has consistently refused to adhere to its constitution which specifically prohibits its participation in partisan political activity. It has refused to abide by the provisions of section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 under which NSA has obtained its tax exemption status. That section of the code allows tax exemptions for "corporations organized and operated exclusively for educational purposes, no substantial part of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence legislation, and which does not participate, or intervene in—including the publishing or distributing of statements—any political campaign."

Despite these two restrictions, NSA continues with its political activity, much of which is an effort to influence legislation before the Congress. Their recent participation in activities which will undermine a strong policy in Vietnam is even more disturbing.

Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated, NSA has adopted resolutions calling for a halt to the bombing raids of Communist North Vietnam, calling for the inclusion of the Vietcong in any negotiations for a ceasefire,

and calling for an end to all U.S. "aggressive military action" in Vietnam.

Three particular items have come to my attention recently, and I feel that these items may warrant a close examination by the appropriate committees of the Congress when the appropriations for the Department of State are considered for oncoming fiscal years.

We have seen that NSA has consistently opposed the position of a strong effort in Vietnam. They are trying to undercut any effort, whether by the Congress or by the President, to strengthen the U.S. position in southeast Asia.

The first item which came to my attention was an article in the Washington Post, Saturday, May 21, 1966, which article stated in part:

"NSA is subsidized with about \$600,000 a year from the Ford, Field and Rockefeller Foundations, the AFL-CIO, the Department of State and other well-heeled organizations."

This article clearly states that part of NSA's funds are received from the Department of State, the very Department which is charged with the responsibility for conducting our foreign policy and carrying out the programs of the administration in southeast Asia, policies and programs which NSA has consistently opposed. Of course, if NSA is engaged in political activity, and it thereby loses its tax exemption, it will place those other tax exempt organizations, such as the Ford, Field, and Rockefeller Foundations, in danger of losing their tax exempt statuses or seriously jeopardizing them.

The second item which came to my attention was the article by Henry Raymond in the New York Times, May 23, 1966, which stated, in part:

"The leadership of the largest American student organization has given . . . a bleak and discouraging account of political unrest and the prospects of the war in South Vietnam."

"A report circulated by the National Student Association predicted that there would be no internal peace in South Vietnam until the United Buddhist Church assumes an active role in a constitutional government. It accused the U.S. for continuing to support the military junta."

"It also urged that American policies, no matter how well intentioned, had hopelessly alienated most of the civilian population, had created suspicions about the United States 'domination' and had generally failed to achieve meaningful goals in economic and social assistance."

"The 4,250 word document is a journal of a two-week visit to South Vietnam last month by Philip Sherburne, N.S.A. president, and two other officers, Malcolm Kovacs and Gregory Dellin."

"Mr. Sherburne, a 23-year-old graduate of the University of Oregon, disclosed yesterday that the delegation had made the trip at the expense of the State Department."

Now, Mr. Speaker, we see that the Department of State, according to NSA's president, is financing the travel of the officers of NSA to South Vietnam who promptly return home and blast away at American foreign policy there. What kind of a ridiculous effort is the Department of State making with NSA and its officials?

As if these two items are not bad enough, I now learn that NSA has been actively supporting the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee—SNCC—the militant black nationalist student organization and the author of the term "black power," for some time, and may even now be financing some of their activities, directly and indirectly. This raises grave problems indeed. If SNCC is being financed, to some extent, by NSA and NSA is being financed to some extent, by the Department of State, then serious problems arise concerning the funding of the organizations. Not only has SNCC

taken an active role in highly disruptive protest demonstrations against the war in Vietnam, but it boycotted the recent White House Conference on Civil Rights because it is opposed to the war in Vietnam and views it as a "class weapon" to draft Negroes for the armed services.

NSA's association with SNCC is a matter of record. Delegates to the 14th National Student Congress of NSA adopted a resolution declaring NSA's approval of the objectives and programs of SNCC. SNCC's membership in the new left, its involvement in the Vietnam protest demonstrations, its demonstrations against the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and its preachings of "black power" inciting class hatred in America do not seem to have affected, in the least, NSA's relationship with SNCC. As recently as January 1966, SNCC issued a policy statement concerning U.S. involvement in Vietnam which was according to SNCC chairman at that time, John Lewis, approved by the entire national staff of SNCC without dissent. The SNCC statement urged draft-age Americans to deliberately avoid military service in Vietnam. The policy statement said, in part:

"We maintain that our country's cry of 'preserve freedom in the world' is a hypocritical mask behind which it squashes liberation movements which are not bound, and refuse to be bound, by the expediencies of the United States cold war policies."

Mr. Speaker, these three items which I have cited today raise serious problems for the Department of State. I surely hope that the Department is not supporting the activities of NSA when it must know that NSA has in the past, is now, and undoubtedly will continue to be an organization opposed to the policies of the United States in southeast Asia, so long as those policies are anything other than withdrawal, but it does appear that way.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Foreign Affairs should consider interrogating the Department on these important items. The Committee on Appropriations and its subcommittee on the Department of State appropriations should consider investigating these charges and should consider requiring the Department to cease its support of this radical student organization which is subverting American foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, I was at that time, and still am, greatly concerned that NSA, an organization that has consistently opposed any strong anti-Communist U.S. foreign policy, has been financed by the instrumentality of our Government charged with the responsibility for carrying out our foreign policy—the Department of State. As I outlined in my July 26 remarks, NSA, while being supported by tax dollars through the Department of State, was making every attempt possible to undermine our Government's announced policy to win the war in Vietnam, a policy that the Department of State was supposedly supporting to the very maximum extent of its efforts.

In my remarks of July 26 I called upon the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations or its subcommittee charged with the responsibility of handling appropriations for the Department of State to investigate fully the matters which I raised in my floor remarks. In the press for adjournment during the closing weeks of the last session, such hearings were not held. To the best of my knowledge, no official of NSA or the Department of State was officially interrogated by any congressional committee on the matters raised in my remarks.

NSA RECEIVING OVER \$400,000 A YEAR FROM THE CIA

Mr. Speaker, I was very distressed to read in several nationally circulated newspapers yesterday—Tuesday, February 14—that the Central Intelligence Agency has been financing the operations of NSA "since the early 1950's" to a tune of around \$400,000 a year some years. Some comments have placed the total figure of CIA financing of NSA at approximately \$3 million over the past 17 years.

For the benefit of the Members, an article on this matter in the Washington Star of Tuesday, February 14, stated, in part:

The Central Intelligence Agency has been supplying financial assistance for the international operations of the National Student Association for the last 17 years, U.S. officials said today.

The government's statement followed a statement by officials of the student organization that they have been receiving heavy government financial aid.

As much as \$400,000 in CIA funds was channeled to NSA annually through foundations in the early 1960's, when the CIA paid between 50 and 85 percent of NSA's yearly budget.

But present NSA officers said last night that for the last two years the student organization has worked to end the "covert relationship" with the CIA, and only 5 percent of its current \$1 million annual budget comes from the intelligence agency.

IMPORTANT QUESTIONS RAISED

There are many important questions which arise from this article.

First, what influence did the CIA have on NSA's official policies when it was supplying 50 and 85 percent of NSA's yearly budget?

Second, if NSA officials did not like the relationship, then why was it tolerated and the CIA's money accepted for 17 years?

Third, if NSA's official positions reflected the wishes of the CIA, then what is the CIA doing having the NSA annual Congresses adopt resolutions in almost total opposition to U.S. foreign policy?

Fourth, despite comments from the Department of State, which is acting as the spokesman of the Federal Government on this matter, that the money was supplied to help American students offset student organizations of Communist-bloc countries who are heavily financed by their governments, what are all the purposes for which NSA expended tax dollars from the CIA?

I find it hard to believe that NSA could have spent 85 percent of a million dollar a year budget on sending students to international conferences. To me, it just is not practicable that NSA could have spent \$850,000 to help American students at international conferences and then spend only the remaining \$150,000 on the multitude of other undertakings of the organization.

Furthermore, if NSA has cut off its financial relationships with the CIA during the past 2 years, as NSA's spokesman said yesterday—David Brinkley said 1965 last night—then why have the latest articles reported that NSA has received "5 percent of its current \$1 million annual budget from the intelligence agency"—

11396

\$50,000. I repeat, \$50,000, for its current operations.

I just cannot imagine the CIA giving NSA 85 percent of NSA's annual budget without dictating the terms, at least the general terms, for its uses.

NSA WORKING AGAINST U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

At the same time that NSA's operations were being financed by the CIA and the Department of State it first, passed a resolution calling for the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities; second, passed a resolution calling for the United States to sponsor the admission of Red China to the United Nations—something clearly in opposition to announced U.S. foreign policy; third, passed a resolution calling for the inclusion of the National Liberation Front—the Vietcong front outfit—in any negotiations for a ceasefire in Vietnam—something clearly out of line with our overtures for a ceasefire; fourth, passed a resolution which called for an end to all U.S. "aggressive military action" in Vietnam—something which smacks our sincere efforts in Vietnam in the face and, fifth, passed a resolution which called for the weakening of our internal security acts.

Why did not the CIA and the Department of State cut off NSA's funds when NSA opposed so vigorously and tried to undermine so extensively our foreign policy efforts? Is it the policy of the instrumentalities of the Federal Government charged with carrying out our foreign policy to finance organizations working to undermine that foreign policy? That seems to be the case in this instance.

CLANDESTINE FINANCING OF NSA

According to the newspaper articles, the CIA has been giving money to Boston located front-foundations who in turn have been giving the funds to NSA. It raises some questions as to whether or not the CIA was not knowingly financing the activities of an organization—NSA—which has consistently worked to undermine our foreign policy.

NSA, CIA, AND PUBLIC POLICIES

Mr. Speaker, it is highly questionable—if not outright dangerous—to have Federal funds going toward the influencing of public policy. It was discouraging to learn that the Department of State was financing NSA at a time when NSA official position—adopted at its national congresses—was in opposition to a strong policy of winning the war in Vietnam, our major foreign policy matter. It is more distressing to learn that NSA's activities—and those activities include supposedly speaking for the thousands of college students on American college campuses—are being financed by a Federal instrumentality to a much greater extent than the Department of State would have ever dared to do. It raises grave questions as to whether or not NSA in calling for the many questionable things which it has called for was speaking for the American college students or one of its principal financial sponsors—the CIA. Surely \$100,000 a year comprised a significant percentage of their total operating funds, surely enough to make them think twice before speaking out on a matter which would

raise the ire of their financial backer—the CIA. Perhaps NSA's declarations that American college students do not support winning the war in Vietnam is not really the voice of the American college community.

NSA VIOLATIONS OF FEDERAL LOBBYING ACTS?

Mr. Speaker, I think this is the appropriate place to point out that there are Federal laws against using Federal funds for lobbying activities. NSA's many appearances before congressional committees in attempts to influence legislation and its financial backing by the CIA—with Federal tax dollars—raises grave questions. NSA officials may be guilty of having violated Federal law.

Mr. Speaker, NSA officials have appeared many times before the committees of Congress to speak out on certain legislation. Not only does this raise questions about NSA's tax-exemption status with respect to overt attempts to influence legislation, but it now raises additional questions about the use of Federal moneys in connection with their appearances. It looks to me like Federal funds were possibly being used to put these student voices on the record before the committees to supposedly speak for the students of America. This also raises grave questions about the use of Federal funds for what actually amounts to lobbying. Has NSA been lobbying before Congress with Federal funds? This is a question which should be answered on the record.

NSA'S DESTRUCTION OF CONFIDENCE IN ITS PURPOSES

Mr. Speaker, insofar as I am concerned, this one incident alone could destroy NSA—and perhaps, in light of the evidence, it should. NSA, while supposedly speaking for American college students, appears to have been speaking for someone else. I cannot personally see how any student body that belongs to NSA could remain in the organization after these recent developments. The NSA national organization can no longer guarantee to them that it is speaking for the college students of America. It can no longer guarantee to them that it is free from outside control. It can no longer guarantee to them that they are getting their money's worth for belonging to it. It can no longer guarantee to them that their voices will be the ones which prevail as the American student consensus rather than the voices of their financial sponsors.

To me, NSA is destroyed as an official voice for the college students of the United States. It could never again represent American college students at international meetings with any prestige. NSA can never again be a trusted organization.

NSA VIOLATING FEDERAL TAX LAWS?

Mr. Speaker, the Internal Revenue Service should conduct an immediate investigation into NSA's tax-exemption status, and particularly into its reporting of income during the past 15 years. Although all the information on their tax reporting which I have been able to round up, to this point, is unofficial, it appears as if NSA has not been accurately reporting the amount or the sources of its total income during recent years.

Yesterday afternoon, Young Americans for Freedom, Inc., the Nation's largest conservative youth organization and one of great respectability, issued a special notice to the Washington press corps that they have available for inspection by all press representatives the complete Federal tax returns, form 990-A, for the years 1952 through 1964, filed by the National Student Association.

While these tax forms show numerous contributions to NSA from foundations labeled in the press as CIA fronts, as well as massive contributions from other obscure groups, they also indicate that income from the CIA fronts was not reported as required by law.

Mr. Speaker, NSA's flagrant violation of Federal laws—with respect to lobbying, with respect to tax reporting, and perhaps even with respect to many other matters—is not a matter to be easily dismissed as "politics." This organization—NSA—has acted outside the law, or at a minimum, serious questions have been raised about the legality of many of their actions.

AMERICAN STUDENTS TURNING THUMBS DOWN ON NSA

Mr. Speaker, the American student community is already reacting sharply against NSA on this matter. Representative of this growing antagonism toward NSA and its clandestine relationships with the CIA is yesterday's announcement by Young Americans for Freedom. At this point in my remarks, under unanimous consent, I include the text of their announcement yesterday.

YAF's announcement follows:

FEBRUARY 14, 1967.

YAF CALLS FOR CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION OF NSA FUNDING BY THE CIA

Young Americans for Freedom, the nation's largest conservative youth group, has called for an immediate Congressional investigation of the relationship between the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Student Association (NSA).

Newspaper reports yesterday said that C.I.A. has been subsidizing the National Student Association at the rate of \$200,000 annually since the early 1950's.

YAF announced that it is contacting the 45 Congressional members of its National Advisory Board, asking them to join in a call for a special investigation to determine:

1) The amount by which the Central Intelligence Agency subsidizes the National Student Association, and why it has subsidized a left-wing group with consistently radical positions;

2) Whether there has been a violation by NSA of the federal law prohibiting tax-exempt groups from seeking to influence legislation before Congress; and

3) Whether the C.I.A. subsidy amounts to a violation of the federal law prohibiting the use of federal funds to influence legislation before Congress.

The National Vice Chairman of YAF, Alan MacKay of Boston, Mass., said in a statement issued in Washington that the National Student Association consistently has taken far-left positions, often agreeing with Communists on major issues. MacKay cited NSA policy statements which call for an immediate halt to all bombing by the U.S. in Viet Nam, participation of the National Liberation Front—the political front of the Viet Cong—in a South Vietnamese coalition government, condemning U.S. aid to the Dominican Republic when the Communists threatened to take over by force, urging admission of Communist China to the United

ditions, supporting the Berkeley students' fight for the disorders there, praising Fidel Castro, and opposing the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

"There can be no justification," McKay said, "for the use of American taxpayers' money to support this kind of radical left-wing group. The Congress has a duty to see that those responsible for this policy in the CIA are removed and that such subsidies are ended."

McKay noted that YAF has in the past repeatedly called for an investigation of NSA's exempt status, since such groups are forbidden by federal law from seeking to influence legislation before Congress.

"CIA has directly violated this law," McKay charged, "and on many occasions NSA officials have appeared before Congressional Committees and led national campaigns to influence legislation."

"Since CIA subsidy funds were routed through such tax-exempt foundations into CIA hands," he added, "these foundations, as well as NSA, should be investigated by the Internal Revenue Service."

McKay also noted that it is against federal law to use federal funds to influence legislation before Congress. He said that any CIA funds given to NSA and used for NSA lobbying activities would be another violation of the law.

The YAF Vice Chairman noted that last summer NSA officials had their expenses paid for a trip to Viet Nam by the U.S. State Department, then returned home and publicly criticized American policy on the Viet Nam war. He also said that NSA has admitted receiving funds from other federal government agencies, such as the Office of Economic Opportunity. McKay charged that this money went in part to foment civil disorder in Southern states, where NSA operatives joined radical civil rights protesters such as SNCC (the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee).

Summing up, McKay stated that "Young Americans for Freedom is deeply shocked that the CIA should secretly attempt to influence student opinion. But we are absolutely astounded to discover that federal funds in huge amounts have been placed in the hands of irresponsible leftists who do not represent American students. We call for an immediate and full Congressional investigation of this matter, as well as an Internal Revenue Service review of the tax-exempt status of NSA."

HEARINGS NEEDED NOW

Mr. Speaker, an investigation of the matters which I have raised last year and which is needed at once. These and other pertinent questions should be answered before a congressional committee of the Department of State, the CIA, the Internal Revenue Service, and representatives of NSA being called as witnesses. This should be done at the earliest possible date. This incident cannot go unnoticed by the Congress. It must be subjected to detailed congressional investigation.

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18, WENDELL WILLKIE WOULD HAVE BEEN 75 YEARS OLD

Mr. KUPFERMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the fact that a great American, Wendell L. Willkie, would have been 75 years old on Saturday, February 18.

In the way that time seems to pass, it has been gone so long that he now

ranks as legend with Abraham Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt, but the concept of "One World," which he gave us, is as current as today's newspaper and the supersonic jet that fulfills his prophecy.

We all, of course, recall his 1940 candidacy for President on the Republican ticket, and I am proud that Freedom House in my district bears his name.

His widow, Edith, resides in my district where his son Phillip is in frequent attendance from the family home in Rushville, Ind.

As time goes by, the figure of Wendell Willkie will loom larger on our historical horizon, and on his 100th birthday, February 18, 1992, we will want to declare a national holiday.

DEMONSTRATORS AT THE PENTAGON

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the demonstrators at the Pentagon and those here in the Halls of Congress yesterday do not speak for the young people of our country. They do not speak for the patriotic mothers of America, nor do they speak for the academic community.

The great majority of American students, both high school and college, scorn such emotionalism. The great majority of American students know that this violent manifestation of disunity only encourages the ruthless aggressor to commit more aggression and to kill and wound more American boys.

Mr. Speaker, colleges and high schools all over the United States including the Southern Association of High School Student Councils, unanimously adopted resolutions supporting our efforts to oppose aggression in Vietnam.

Night before last, when these "peace-niks" were planning their assault upon the Pentagon and upon the National Government on Capitol Hill, a young high school student in my district sat down in the quiet of her own home and wrote me an encouraging and patriotic letter, very vividly portraying why we must remain in South Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues in Congress, and my fellow Americans, I share with you this timely and superb letter of this young teenager, Miss Martha Sue Hudgens, an 11th-grade student at Easley Senior High School, Easley, S.C., expressing why our Government must stand guard on the ramparts of freedom in South Vietnam.

DEAR SIR: I am an eleventh grader at Easley Senior High School where you gave a speech yesterday. I was moved by the speech you gave to us, and I want to say that I am behind our guys in Viet Nam one hundred per cent. I believe that the only solution to ending the war is to send those of our generation who are able to fight. So many people argue this point because many of our citizens are killed. I know how it is to lose a loved one in Viet Nam, because my boyfriend was killed there three months ago. But I have the satisfaction of knowing that Billy, my boyfriend, died for his country, which should be the most important thing to all of us who call ourselves United States citizens.

Those who demonstrate for peace throughout our nation should wake up to the fact that if we do not stand up to the Communists in Viet Nam, we may lose the freedoms we have today. If people would not take their freedoms for granted, and would stop to think what life would be like without them, maybe they would stop those demonstrations against the war.

People say that America is the land of life, liberty, and happiness, but how long can this last if we do not continue our fight against oppression in every part of the world? Eventually America could corrupt beneath our feet. Why can't people see this? Why don't they look into the future of America? Maybe then they could see the necessity of having American men in Viet Nam.

As I sit here in my home and realize how little I am doing for the future freedom of America, it frightens me. But I realize that the war cannot be won by one individual—all Americans must stick together. I wish I could do more than pray, hope, and support our boys in Viet Nam, but each time I try, I am told that I am too young. However, in a year or two I will be of age to join the Armed Services, and if the Lord is willing, I will. Then I can devote my life to the service of my country.

When you go to our schools in each county, please try to make the teenagers understand that our generation is the future of the world, and that they are needed to help by backing our guys in Viet Nam. Also assure them that even though some are killed, those who are will be fighting for their country and if they are like Billy, they will die doing the most important thing in their lives. Billy wrote and told me that if anything happened to him, he would know that his death would soon lead to freedom for the entire nation.

You are the main person that teenagers will listen to, and you and other government officials must try to make them understand why we must fight in Viet Nam.

Thank you again for visiting our school. I just hope it means as much to others as it did to me.

Sincerely,

MARTHA SUE HUDGENS.

CIVIL RIGHTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 56)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Almost two centuries ago, the American people declared these truths to be self-evident:

That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Seventy-five years later, a savage war tested the foundations of their democratic faith. The issue of the struggle was, as Lincoln said, whether "we shall nobly save, or meanly lose, the last, best hope on earth."

Democracy triumphed in the field in 1865. But for the Negro American, emancipation from slavery was but the first engagement in a long campaign. He had still to endure the assaults of discrimination that denied him a decent home, refused his children a good education, closed the doors of economic progress against him, turned him away at the voting booth, the jury box, at places of public accommodation, seated